

**Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA.**—Soon after the issue of a notification under Section 6 of the Land Acquisition Act in that case, complaints were received by the Government against the acquisition. The main objection raised was that the site was not suitable for the market yard as there was the constant danger of floods and the market yard was not sufficient for a growing market. The acquisition proceedings were said to have been pushed through without having regard to local conditions. There is no room for further expansion of the present market yard. These were the objections raised by the local people. After listening to all the complaints, after consulting the important people who count there, Government took the decision to withdraw the acquisition proceedings.

**Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.**—The matter is before the High Court. A stay order has been issued.

**Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA.**—With regard to the question of interest, I must inform the House that the interest that is payable both in Madras and Bombay is 4%. We have proposed 4½%. At one time when Government securities were carrying interest at 7% we thought of 6%, but Government securities do not carry interest at 7% now.

**Sri Kenchappa** and a few others referred to the delay in the payment of compensation. It is true that in some cases there has been undue delay because of certain departments, particularly the local bodies, taking possession of the land without initiating acquisition proceedings. Therefore in order to avoid delay in the payment of compensation, Government have recently taken a decision to pay interim compensation pending final payment of compensation.

**Sri MUDALAGIRI GOWDA.**—No such provision is found in the Bill.

**Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA.**—It is unnecessary to provide for it in the Bill.

Sir, the very fact that Government have come forward with a motion for reference of the Bill to the Select Committee, would indicate that Government is not anxious to keep every

provision of the Bill as it is. Government is prepared to accept any reasonable amendment. I submit there is no need for so much heat as far as this measure is concerned. We do not propose to introduce a law, which is not already in force in other places.

**Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.**—The question is :

“ That this House concurs in the appointment of a Joint Select Committee of the two Houses consisting of a total number of 18 members, 12 members from the Legislative Assembly and 6 members from the Legislative Council, to consider the Land Acquisition (Mysore Extension and Amendment) Bill, 1958, and the following members of this House shall be the members of the Joint Select Committee :

Sriyuts :

- 1 D. Devaraj Ura.
- 2 Dr. A. R. Karisiddappa
- 3 T. R. Parameshwariah
- 4 J. Narayanappa
- 5 Basan Gowda
- 6 P. G. Sidhanti
- 7 B. Vaikunta Baliga
- 8 M. P. Patil
- 9 Y. Veerappa
- 10 M. Ramappa
- 11 Putte Gowda
- 12 K. Kenchappa ”

*The motion was adopted.*

## MYSORE RENT CONTROL BILL, 1959.

*Motion to suspend Rule 243.*

**Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA** (Minister for Revenue).—Sir, I am obliged to make a motion similar to the one made by me yesterday. The same difficulty is there even with regard to this Bill. Yesterday I explained the difficulty. Sir, I move :

“ That under rule 322 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in the Mysore Legislative Assembly rule 243 be

suspended in its application to the motion for reference of the Mysore Rent Control Bill to a Joint Select Committee."

**Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN** (Kolar Gold Fields).—Sir, he should give the reasons once again.

**Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA**.—I have already stated that according to the rules we have adopted in this House, the proportion of members to be nominated to a Joint Select Committee is 3:1. These rules were revised recently. Unfortunately the old rules are in force in the Upper House and action has been taken to revise them. A Committee has been set up and it is examining the whole question. It may take some time before the new rules are adopted in the Upper House. In the old rules that are already in force in the Upper House the proportion is 2:1. Therefore they have passed a motion in the Upper House to the effect that the Bill be referred to a Joint Select Committee consisting of 6 members of that House and 12 members of this House. My friend Sri Vaikunta Baliga yesterday was pleased to say that after all the Upper House is not an alien body and that it is a limb of the same Legislature. Therefore we must not make much of the matter that we are agreeing to a proposal inconsistent with the provisions that are in vogue in this House.

**Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA** (Gubbi).—Yesterday there was a ruling by the Chair that it was only with regard to the Bill that was discussed and referred to a Joint Select Committee yesterday.

**Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA**.—How can you change the provisions?

**Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA**.—Yesterday an assurance was given by the Speaker that this was only with regard to the Bill discussed yesterday. You please refer to the proceedings. How can the Government come now and then and make such motions?

**Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA**.—The motion I made yesterday referred to that particular Bill and I also referred to the need for invoking the suspension of the clause for some other Bills. I

think I specifically mentioned that there were two or three Bills more of the same type where there was need for suspending the rule.

**Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA**.—Before you give a ruling I humbly submit to the Chair to take out the proceedings of yesterday. It was a definite assurance given by the Chair and the Government that it was with regard to the Land Acquisition Bill; with what face do the Government come once again and ask for the suspension of the clause with regard to another Bill? That is why I humbly appeal that the Government should not go back on the promise made on the floor of the House yesterday.

[**MR. SPEAKER IN THE CHAIR**]

**Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA**.—The Hon'ble Member is trying to create a wrong impression in the mind of the House. I specifically said yesterday that there were two or three Bills more of the type of the Bill which was under consideration then. I mentioned the same difficulty yesterday.

**Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN**.—Yesterday when this matter was considered there were only two reasons given and they are being repeated today. One objection which escaped our notice yesterday was, that no member was entitled to refer to any discussion that takes place in the Council. As a member of this House I am precluded from referring to the discussions that take place in the other House. If that is the rule in relation to a member, how is it that the Minister while introducing a Bill is permitted to refer to what transpired or what is likely to transpire or what may be the intention of the Council. We are not at all concerned with all those things.

**Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA**.—I did not refer to any discussion that took place in the other House.

**Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN**.—You definitely referred to it. The only valid reason that was advanced was that the Legislative Council had not yet revised their rules in regard to the proportion and he made a reference to the fact that amendments were under contemplation and for that I have a

(SRI M. C. NARASIMHAN)

serious objection because a member is not entitled to refer to any matter that is going on in the Council. When that is so, how is the Minister specially competent to refer to what is being discussed or what is likely to be discussed in the other House? We cannot take cognisance of that. That is why I wanted the Minister to state the special considerations which enabled the Speaker to come to the conclusion that the rule should be suspended. The Chair gave a ruling in regard to the Land Acquisition (Amendment) Bill. What is the compelling reason to suspend the rule in regard to the House Rent Control Bill? This is really a fraud on our rules. Instead of that why not say once and for all that we shall suspend our rules in regard to each Bill till such time as the Legislative Council revised their rules to get over the difficulty? The procedure now adopted amounts to a fraud on our rules. Under these circumstances this ought not to be allowed.

SRI KADIDAL MANJAPPA.—I have already submitted that the reasons that I mentioned yesterday hold good in this case also. I mentioned yesterday that there were three or four Bills which had been sent from the Legislative Council for which we would have to invoke special provisions and what I said yesterday holds good in respect of this Bill also.

MR. SPEAKER.—After hearing both sides I must make the position quite clear. Yesterday it was made clear that the rules had to be suspended not once in the case of the Land Acquisition Bill but also in respect of three other Bills. Really it is not a happy thing that we have been called upon to suspend the rules. But under the circumstances it cannot be helped. Otherwise these four Bills cannot be referred to a Joint Select Committee. As I have explained just now members will bear with the situation and agree to suspend the rule. I now put the motion: The question is:

“That under rule 322 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in the Mysore Legislative Assembly rule 243 be suspended in its application to the motion for reference of the Mysore Rent Control Bill to a Joint Select Committee.”

*The motion was adopted.*

11-30 A.M.

*Motion to concur in the appointment of a Joint Select Committee.*

SRI KADIDAL MANJAPPA.—I beg to move:

“That this House concurs in the appointment of a Joint Select Committee of the two Houses consisting of a total number of 18 members, 12 members from the Legislative Assembly and 6 members from the Legislative Council, to consider the Mysore Rent Control Bill, 1958, and that the following members of this House shall be members of the Joint Select Committee:

Sriyuts:

- 1 H. V. Koujalgi
- 2 T. Hanumiah
- 3 Kumar Naik
- 4 F. H. Mohsin
- 5 D. T. Seetharama Rao
- 6 R. C. Patil
- 7 K. S. Suryanarayana Rao
- 8 Dr. T. Parthasarathy
- 9 T. D. Maranna
- 10 K. T. Jambanna
- 11 G. N. Puttanna
- 12 C. K. Rajaiah Setty.”

MR. SPEAKER.—Motion moved:

“That this House concurs in the appointment of a Joint Select Committee of the two Houses consisting of a total number of 18 members, 12 members from the Legislative Assembly and 6 members from the Legislative Council, to consider the Mysore Rent Control Bill, 1958,